United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR .	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,494	06/30/2003	Brian J. Smyth	600754-3U1	6765
	7590 10/18/2007 STRAUSS HAUER & FE	LD LLP	EXAM	INER
One Commerce Square			MANCHO, RONNIE M	
Suite 2200 2005 Market St	treet		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Philadelphia, P.			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/611,494	SMYTH ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Ronnie Mancho	3663	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHOWHIC - Externafter - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is used to be a sound to	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	L. viely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•		
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Au This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	•	
Dispositi	on of Claims		•	
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 16-22 and 81-106 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 16-22 and 81-106 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)⊠ [·]	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2007 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the conference of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	a) accepted or b) objected t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te	

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Remark

1. The colored drawings and artifact submitted 5/25/07 have been received. See drawing objection below.

Drawings

- 2. The drawings were received on 8/16/07. These drawings are all not acceptable. That is figs. 20-30, 40-42, 46, 47, 49, 53, 54, 59, 60, 65, 66 are fuzzy and clearer drawings are required.
- 3. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because as indicated above are not legible. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 16-22, 81-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Myr (2001/0029425).

Art Unit: 3663

Regarding claim 16, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; pages 3-8) discloses a computer-implemented method of creating a virtual traffic network representing traffic conditions on a road system, the method comprising:

- (a) inputting into a processor (CTU, see 0136; fig. 13) map data representing a road system, the road system being defined by a plurality of links (at 6 in fig. 13, the CTU receives map data about road systems. As clearly seen in figs. 20-23, the road systems inputted in the CTU are defined by a plurality of links; sec. 0162-0170, the links disclosed in the prior art figs. 20-23 meet applicant's definition of links e.g. a stretch of road between two nodes, etc in applicant's page 12, last section);
- (b) inputting into the processor (CTU, see 0136; fig. 13) flow data related to traffic flow on the road system (in sec. 0135 updated traffic flow data and accident reports which are related to traffic flow are inputted in the CTU; in sec 0046 traffic situation on the roads which is related to traffic flow is inputted in the CTU. In the abstract, and sec. 0100, the probe vehicles act as sensors on the road links for collecting traffic flow data and forwarding the data to the CTU, etc);
- (c) inputting into the processor (CTU, sec 0136; fig. 13) information about traffic events, including information that correlates the traffic events to one or more of the links on the road system (in sec. 0136 traffic information about traffic events such as accidents, weather are inputted into the CTU. In section 0100 probe vehicle transmit traffic information such as traffic congestion to the CTU, etc), wherein the traffic events are occurrences on the road system (figs. 9, 17, 20, 21, etc; sec. 0114 to 0121, 0152, 0163, 0167 to 0170) which may have an impact on the flow of traffic, and the traffic event information is inputted into the processor separately from the flow data related to the traffic flow (in section 0013, 0018, traffic flow data and traffic event

Art Unit: 3663

data are collected separately for each section or road link shown in figs. 9, 17, 20, 21, etc; sec. 0114 to 0121, 0152, 0163, 0167 to 0170); and

(d) the processor (CTU, see sec. 0010-0021) integrating the map data, the flow data and the traffic information to produce a virtual traffic network representing traffic conditions on the road system (at sec 0013-0018, 0063-0069, 019-0021; figs. 20-23 a virtual traffic network is produced as it is distributed to other vehicles requesting navigation guidance, the process is summarized in the abstract, sec. 0013-0021), wherein the virtual traffic network indicates both the flow data and the traffic event information (sec. 0013 to 0018, 0114 to 0121, 0152, 0163, 0167to 0170).

Regarding claim 17, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein the flow data is real-time flow data, the virtual traffic network representing real-time traffic conditions on the road system.

Regarding claim 18, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein the flow data is input from a plurality of road sensors.

Regarding claim 19, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein step (a) further comprises customizing the map data to define locally known features of the road system.

Regarding claim 20, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein one of the traffic events are incidents and the information includes information related to incidents on the road system.

Art Unit: 3663

Regarding claim 21, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein the map data, the flow data and the information have a synaptic relationship with each other.

Regarding claim 22, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein the virtual traffic network is spatially oriented.

Regarding claim 95, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein each link represents a distinct stretch of the road system between two nodes, each node being a decision point on the road system (sec. 0013 to 0018, 0114 to 0121, 0152, 0163, 0167 to 0170).

Regarding claim 96, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein each link represents a distinct stretch of the road system between two nodes, each node being where two or more roadways merge together (figs. 9, 17, 20, 21, etc; sec. 0114 to 0121, 0152, 0163, 0167 to 0170).

Regarding claim 97, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 wherein step (c) is performed by a human operator (figs. 8, 13, sec. 0112, 0136).

Regarding claim 97, Myr (figs. 1, 3-5, 11, 13, 17, 18; abstract; sec. 0013-0021) discloses the method of claim 16 further comprising:

(e) graphically displaying the virtual traffic network, including the map data, the flow data and the traffic event information (figs. 8, 13, sec. 0112, 0136).

Art Unit: 3663

Myr anticipates claims 81-94, 99-106. That is Myr anticipates claims 16-22 and since claims 81-94, 99-106 are not patentably distinct from claims 16-22, Myr also anticipates claims 81-92

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/16/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant indicates there was an agreement that the claims are patentable over Myr in the interview of 6-27-07. The examiner disagrees. The interview summary does not make such a statement. Applicant during the interview indicated that there are differences between the invention and the prior art and proposed to amend the claims to overcome the prior art. The applicant did not particularly disclose differences believed to overcome the prior during the interview.

Upon careful consideration of applicant's amendments and arguments and review of the Myr reference, it is noted that Myr still reads on applicant's claimed invention.

The drawings submitted 8/16/06 have been received, but some of the drawings as indicated above are fuzzy. Applicant is requested to provide clearer drawings.

Applicant traverses the 102 rejections citing that Myr does not disclose correlating an accident report or weather report with a particular link of a roadway. The claimed language is BROAD. Limitations from the specification are not to be read into the claim language. Myr anticipates applicant's definition of links because according to applicant's definition, Myr (figs. 20-23) disclose a stretch of road between two nodes. It is further noted that Myr (figs. 9, 17, 20,

Art Unit: 3663

21, etc; sec. 0013 to 0018, 0114 to 0121, 0152, 0163, 0167 to 0170) anticipate the limitation. Applicant's argument that figure 11 discloses zones and not road links is not convincing. The zones in fig. 11 are defined by roads (Myr, sec. 0124, 0126, 0135). As can also be seen in figs. 11 and 13, the zones are made up of roads. Therefore accidents, weather and traffic flow data, etc corresponding to a zone also correspond particularly to the road link in that zone. It would be ingenious to indicate that there is traffic congestion or a ROAD accident for example in zone 11 of fig. 11 when there is no road section disclosed in that section or when that section is not considered. Therefore, when reports are made of road accidents in zone 6 (fig. 11), it implies that there is a *road* in zone 6 where a *road* accident occurred. Applicant's arguments are focused mainly on fig. 13, but fails to consider figs. 17, 20-24, etc. It is further noted that applicant's statements on page 11 of arguments such as, "Myr identifies the road within the zone that correlates to traffic event (e.g., accident report)"; "the specific road sections where these accidents occurred", etc are indications that the prior art anticipates the limitations as claimed.

Applicant's argument with reference to the limitation, CPU in the prior art does not correlate the zones with the links on a road system, is not claimed. That is the processor or CPU was not claimed to do correlation. It is further noted that Applicant's statement, "Myr does not disclose or suggest that anything else is done with the congestion/bottleneck information" is not claimed.

Applicant has ignored the sections e.g. 0013-0021, 0063-0069, figs. 20-23 cited by the examiner. These sections clearly indicate anticipation of the claims. The applicant merely indicates that these sections do not anticipate the claim.

It is believed that the rejections are proper and thus stand.

Art Unit: 3663

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronnie Mancho whose telephone number is 571-272-6984. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs: 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ronnie Mancho Examiner Art Unit 3663

10/5/2007

